

Remarks:

This amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay.

With regard to the §112 rejection on new matter for the restriction "slidably receiving the one resistor" in claim 17, the examiner's attention is directed to the paragraph on page 5 of WO 20004/018943 toward the bottom of the page that "Such first members are connected to a support frame 9 and define seats wherein portions of resistor 4 are slidably held." This provides full support for the questioned language of claim 17.

Similarly with respect to the §112 rejection on new matter for the restriction "the one resistor has two short and oppose portions that remain cold upon electrical energization of said one resistor" in claim 10, the examiner's attention is directed to the paragraph on page 6 of WO 20004/018943 toward the bottom of the page that "In order to improve the radiance distribution, besides members 12 that partly hinder the energy radiated by resistor 4 towards the upper portion of body 2 of oven 1, the two short opposed portions 21 and 22 of resistor 4 remain cold upon switch on." Thus claim 10 is supported in the original application papers.

Main claim 17 has been amended to correct some minor errors and to include the subject matter of now canceled claims 6, 7 and 8. Thus claim 17 now clearly describes how the one portion of the resistor is flanked by two longitudinally extending bars (8 in FIG. 3) and underlain by another bar (12 in FIG. 3) that serves to reflect radiant energy downward into the lower chamber.

In newly cited US '154 of Christiansson it is true that the lower set of bars is held in a grid where some elements do extend above them and therefore reflect some energy downward, but this is a purely accidental effect and has nothing to do with what is defined in claim 17.

More particularly in Christiansson the assembly shown in FIG. 3 does not as clearly shown in FIG. 1 define a pair of baking chambers. The space underneath the lower array cannot possibly be considered a baking chamber, but is just enough clearance to allow the lower heating unit to be removed; nothing could be baked in it.

Going further, the bars 28 of the frame holding the resistance heater 26 of Christiansson always cross the heater transversely. Where they extend longitudinally care is taken to space them from the heater since the intent here is clearly to prevent this structure from blocking radiant energy from going upward, where it does enter the single baking chamber and actually does some work.

In other words Christiansson is a single-chamber oven where the frame holding the lower heating resistor 26 is carefully engineered to cross it only transversely to block as little as possible of the upwardly directed radiant energy. Hence the goal of the structure in Christiansson is the opposite of that of the instant invention, where the intent is to block as much as possible of the upwardly directed radiant energy.

Thus Christiansson lacks specifically recited structure of amended claim 17, namely two "baking" chambers and a "longitudinal" bar extending above a "longitudinal" portion of the heater to block upward radiation. Thus the claims are clearly allowable over Christiansson under §102. Since in Christiansson care is taken to prevent the bars of the frame from blocking upwardly directed radiant energy, it would not be obvious to arrange them to do the obvious, and therefore a §103 rejection is similarly out of the question

Allowance of all claims and passage to issue are in order.

If only minor problems that could be corrected by means of a telephone conference stand in the way of allowance of this

case, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned to make the necessary corrections.

K.F. Ross P.C.

/Andrew Wilford/

by: Andrew Wilford, 26,597
Attorney for Applicant

05 April 2009
5683 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: 718 884-6600
Fax: 718 601-1099
Email: email@kfrpc.com

Enclosure: None.